

Gross national product, budget expenditures, surplus or deficit, cost of living increase, and declining value of the dollar, 1949-62—Continued

¹ From 1963 budget message—original fiscal 1963 budget revenue estimates are based on attaining this rate in calendar 1962. Second quarter rate was \$552.0 billion.

² Second quarter rate.

³ July 1962; new record high.

⁴ July 1962; new record low.

Sources: Various official documents.

CONCLUSION

Mr. Speaker, as will be noted, and as a conclusive reminder of the results of our profligacy, and of our precarious and worsening financial situation, foreign holders of our dollars and claims on our gold have been calling for gold. They are apprehensive. We cannot expect them to maintain faith in our dollar when we ourselves so heedlessly and so consistently continue to depreciate it. It is our dollar; not theirs. If we will not respect its traditional value, neither will they.

The President's state of the Union address to Congress at the beginning of this session ranked inflation in the forefront of the enemies of freedom. He also submitted a budget in balance—precariously, tenuously, it is true, but nonetheless slightly in balance. And he urged the cooperation of the Congress to keep it in balance. Of course, like so many past budgets, its balance was prospectively arrived at; it rested on estimated uncertainties as to revenues. Like so many past budgets, it violated rules of prudence by failing to allow clear safety margins as a hedge against overoptimism. For months the financial writers and market analysts have been saying we would incur another deficit. It is now clear—and universally conceded—that we will close the fiscal year again deeply in the red. In the last 8 years, 1955-62, final results, for a variety of reasons, varied from original budget predictions and recommendations by over \$28 billion—that much deeper than had been originally budgeted.

Jefferson's admonition is particularly applicable in this emergency:

I place economy among the first and most important virtues, and public debt as the greatest of dangers to be feared. To preserve our independence, we must not let our rulers load us with perpetual debt. We must make our choice between economy and liberty or profusion and servitude. If we run into such debts, we must be taxed in our meat and drink, in our necessities and our comforts, in our labors and in our amusements. If we can prevent the Government from wasting the labors of the people, under the pretense of caring for them, they will be happy.

Mr. Speaker, but for the indefatigable labor and sound business judgment of the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] and others who have stood with him during his 40 years of dedicated service to the reduction of the budgets, the national debt, frightening and dangerous as it is—the national debt would be even billions and billions higher today. When the gentleman from New York, JOHN TABER, came to the House in 1923, the national debt was \$22 billion. Today it is \$302 billion—and going higher.

When JOHN TABER came to the House in 1923, the annual expenditure of the

Government was \$3 billion. Today it is \$115 billion—and going higher.

When JOHN TABER came to the House in 1923, there were 536,000 Federal employees. Today there are 2,514,000—and there will be more.

The inescapable consequences in store for us if this trend continues indefinitely are unpredictable. In this situation we are not in position to further expand the Federal establishment or undertake additional obligations beyond those absolutely essential. On the contrary it is high time we took carefully considered measures to retrench expenditures, put in motion efforts to reduce surplus activities, reduce the cost of living, and adopt a program for methodical and periodical reduction of the public debt.

[Mr. HALLECK addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

THE 2D SESSION OF THE 87TH CONGRESS

(Mr. ALBERT asked and was given permission to address the House for 3 minutes.)

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I join the distinguished minority leader in his tribute to retiring Members. I want particularly to pay tribute to my Democratic colleagues who will not be with us next year. They are: Representative BUER P. HARRISON, of Virginia; Representative MERWIN COAD, of Iowa; Representative MORGAN MOULDER, of Missouri; Representative DANIEL BREWSTER, of Maryland; Representative SIDNEY YATES, of Illinois; Representative FRED MARSHALL, of Minnesota; Representative DANIEL INOUE, of Hawaii; Representative BRENT SPENCE, of Kentucky; Representative IRIS F. BLITCH, of Georgia; Representative CATHERINE NOBLE, of Arkansas; Representative CORINNE RILEY, of South Carolina; Representative GRACIE POST, of Idaho; Representative VICTOR ANFUSO, of New York; Representative KATHERYN GRANAHAN, of Pennsylvania; Representative FRANK BOYKIN, of Alabama; Representative FRANK SMITH, of Mississippi; Representative FRANK KOWALSKI, of Connecticut; Representative HAROLD McSWEEN, of Louisiana; Representative DALE ALFORD, of Arkansas; Representative JAMES FRAZIER, of Tennessee; Representative HERBERT ZELENSKO, of New York; Representative JAMES C. DAVIS, of Georgia.

Mr. Speaker, the 2d session of the 87th Congress has been notable in many respects and in its waning hours I should like to comment very briefly and generally concerning those events and the great personalities which carried them forward. Although we have been constrained to spend more time in session than is usual, and at considerable sac-

rifice for many of our Members, I believe we can now lay down our burdens secure in the knowledge that we have met our legislative obligations to the best of our ability and that the record of this session bears the stamp of solid accomplishment in many vital areas, both domestic and foreign.

The House now concludes its first year of operation under the guidance of the gentleman from Massachusetts, Speaker McCORMACK, whose leadership has been ably and adroitly executed during the past 10 months. His performance during this time of stress and unprecedented challenge has been outstanding. His reputation as one of the truly great Speakers of this House is sealed with the record of this session. I extend my personal thanks to the Speaker for the many, many considerations he has shown me. I believe my appreciation also expresses the sense of the Members on both sides of the aisle.

The Speaker loves and seeks to serve with fairness and dedication every Member of the House. As the devoted leader of his party he has given skilled effort and tireless attention to the great program of President Kennedy.

The leadership is deeply in the debt of its Democratic whip, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BOGGS] and his assistant whips, for the truly magnificent work they have done during this session. They have been extremely accurate in their polls on legislative matters. For outstanding and devoted assistance on so many occasions, I personally am deeply indebted to my friend and coworker, the gentleman from Louisiana, HALE BOGGS.

I can find no adequate words to give full expression to the gratitude I feel toward all the Members of the House, both Democrats and Republicans, for the many kindnesses they have shown me. Members of my own party have given me support and help of a measure far greater than I could have hoped to receive.

My Republican friends have shown me innumerable courtesies. I extend my thanks to all of them and particularly to their distinguished minority leader, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] and to the very able minority whip, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS]. They have been most kind and considerate to me in all personal matters and in all matters involving the efficient and orderly operation of the House. They are great Americans and I am happy to say they are my personal friends.

Without the cooperation and state-manship of the minority leadership the course of this House would have been far less stable, and far less productive in the very vital areas of our national defense and foreign policy. For if we are divided by political ideology, we are united by mutual recognition of our common purpose to serve our people and our country above all else.

The Members of the House have given lavishly to this body and to the Nation, of the best of their talents, almost entirely of their time, and with superb de-

OCTOBER 11, 1962.

termination to meet the myriad challenges and problems which have faced them constantly during this session.

The Members of the House, its officers, and employees, all have given tireless devotion and effort during this long and arduous session. Our Parliamentarian, Lew Deshler, whose workday and workload are exceeded only by his great talents and knowledge, was ill for a few days last week but we are fortunate now to have him back among us during the closing hours of this session. Lew Deshler has no peer in his field. His services are essential to the functioning of the House. He has been a bulwark of strength not only in his capacity as the leading parliamentarian of the world but as a wise and experienced servant of this House. He has through every hour of every session been the strong, indispensable right arm of the leadership on both sides of the aisle.

I hope that the months ahead will bring opportunity for rest and relaxation for the Members and officers and employees, all of whom have worked hard and deserve a time away from their strenuous routines. Again I thank you for your friendship and your help. I wish for each and every one of you good health and good fortune, in the present and in the future.

COMMITTEE TO NOTIFY PRESIDENT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. Res. 835

Resolved, That a committee of two Members be appointed by the House to join a similar committee appointed by the Senate to wait upon the President of the United States and inform him that the two Houses have completed their business of the session and are ready to adjourn unless the President has some further communication to make to them.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. The Chair appoints as Members on the part of the House of the committee to notify the President the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT] and the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK].

NATIONAL FISHERIES CENTER AND AQUARIUM ADVISORY BOARD

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of section 5(a), Public Law 87-758, the Chair appoints as members of the National Fisheries Center and Aquarium Advisory Board the following Members on the part of the House: The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN] and the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN].

WORK PLANS RECOMMENDED UNDER WATERSHED PROTECTION AND FLOOD PREVENTION ACT

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication which was read by the Clerk and referred to the Committee on Appropriations:

Hon. JOHN W. MCCORMACK,
The Speaker,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the provisions of section 2 of the Watershed Protection

and Flood Prevention Act, as amended, the Committee on Public Works has approved the work plans transmitted to you which were referred to this committee. The work plans involved are:

State	Watershed	Executive Communication No.	Committee approval
Alabama	Town Creek	2289	Oct. 2, 1962
Delaware and Pennsylvania	Brandywine Creek	2424	Do.
Georgia	Tobesofkee Creek (supplemental)	2535	Do.
Kansas	Twin Caney	2424	Do.
Oklahoma	Upper Blue River	2289	Do.
Do.	Cottonwood Creek	2535	Do.
Do.	Delaware Creek	2535	Do.
Pennsylvania	Sandy Creek	2424	Do.
South Carolina	Thicketty Creek	2289	Do.
Texas	Salado Creek	2424	Do.
Do.	Valley Creek	2424	Do.
Wyoming	Boulder Lake	2572	Do.

Sincerely yours,
CHARLES A. BUCKLEY,
Chairman, Committee on Public Works.

(Mr. GRAY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

[Mr. GRAY'S remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

MATTER OF CONSCIENCE

(Mr. CRAMER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, in the Cuban ransom blackmail deal, it is becoming more evident that the attempt to raise moneys, foodstuffs, and medicines to be turned over to Castro to help keep him in power, could properly be described as a "Kennedy Conscience Fund" for the failure of the Bay of Pigs invasion. The following editorial from the Tampa Tribune in my district indicates that this is what that newspaper thinks, which is in support of what I have been saying:

MATTER OF CONSCIENCE

The more that leaks out about the proposed ransoming of the 1,113 Cuban invasion prisoners, the worse the deal looks for the United States.

All the signs suggest that the ransom is not only approved by President Kennedy but that most of the food, medicine, and money handed over to Fidel Castro will come from American taxpayers. Nobody knows what the final agreement may call for but Castro originally demanded \$62 million; if he knows that the President is behind the negotiations, he is not likely to settle for less.

And Castro can hardly fail to know. The New York World-Telegram said yesterday that the American negotiator, New York lawyer James B. Donovan, was given the assignment last June by none other than Attorney General Robert Kennedy.

An earlier tipoff came in a column by Joseph Alsop, published on this page Tuesday. Alsop, who is close to the Kennedys, said in effect that the President had decided to ransom the prisoners as a matter of conscience, because he was responsible for the bungled invasion.

A further clue is the fact that the committee of Cuban exiles which for some months has been attempting to raise the ransom money by private donation has had little success. The only fairy godmother with the equivalent of \$60 million to drop in

the pot is the Federal Government. The money presumably could be taken from the funds of the Central Intelligence Agency, which makes no public accounting of its spending.

Now, we have deep sympathy for the 1,113 captives and all the thousands of less-publicized prisoners rotting in Castro's jails. We also can appreciate President Kennedy's lacerations of conscience, from the nagging knowledge that his denial of air support wrecked the invasion and caused the capture of most of the little army of freedom fighters.

But there are more than the welfare of prisoners and the mental comfort of the President to consider.

There are, for example, the national honor and the campaign to free Cuba from communism.

Our prestige suffered enough from the Bay of Pigs defeat, when the world's mightiest nation permitted itself to be humiliated by a Red dwarf. What will Latin America and the rest of the world think of our now buying back the prisoners—instead of rescuing them at gunpoint?

Even worse, perhaps, in the world's view will be the inconsistency of threatening to penalize Allied countries whose ships carry cargoes to Cuba at the very time our Government is preparing to ship to Castro invaluable supplies of food and medicine. Who can understand such a violent contradiction in declared policy?

We are reminded of President Kennedy's stirring words in announcing the failure of the invasion in April 1961. Speaking sternly of the necessity for resolute action to maintain freedom in this hemisphere, he said "the complacent, the self-indulgent, the soft societies will be swept away with the debris of history."

Ransoming the prisoners, we submit, is the course of softness. Unless the President begins to meet the Cuban problem with some of the promised toughness of spirit, more of free Latin America will become debris on the Red tide. And Mr. Kennedy then will have on his conscience not 1,113 prisoners but millions.

CIA REF. P. 10001 UNANIMOUS OPPOSITION EXPRESSED TO BLACKMAIL RANSOM PROPOSALS BY CASTRO TO FREE CUBAN PRISONERS

(Mr. CRAMER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, in recent weeks, with the negotiations of James Donovan with Castro for the payment of

\$62 million in foodstuffs and medicine to Castro, public indignation over these negotiations by a private citizen, apparently committing the United States, and certainly under authority of the U.S. Government, has resulted in expressions from all over the country of indignation.

This appeasement is to be compared to strong language over Cuba used in the 1960 campaign, which I set out hereafter:

J.F.K.'s Big 1960 Promises About Cuba

In the light of developments of the past 20 months, there is a hollow sound to J.F.K.'s glowing promises about Cuba, made when he was seeking the Presidency in 1960. Why not write a "letter to the editor" using these quotations? Here are a few of them:

"I want people to wake up all over the world in the next years and wonder not what Mr. Khrushchev is doing or what Mr. Castro is doing. I want them to wonder what the United States is doing."—Candidate J.F.K., Queens, N.Y., October 27, 1960.

"Mr. Nixon hasn't mentioned Cuba very prominently in this campaign. He talks about standing firm in Berlin, standing firm in the Far East, standing up to Khrushchev, but he never mentions standing firm in Cuba—and if you can't stand up to Castro, how can you be expected to stand up to Khrushchev?"—Candidate J.F.K., Johnstown, Pa., October 15, 1960.

"We must let Mr. Castro know that we do not intend to be pushed around any longer and in particular do not intend to be pushed out of our naval base at Guantanamo or denied fair compensation for American property he has seized."—Candidate J.F.K., Johnstown, Pa., October 15, 1960.

"We must let Mr. Khrushchev know that we are permitting no expansion of his foothold in our hemisphere."—Candidate J.F.K., Johnstown, Pa., October 15, 1960.

"I am not satisfied to have the hand of the Communists move 3,000 miles from East Berlin to our former good neighbor in Cuba, only 90 miles from the coast of Florida, only 8 minutes by jet."—Candidate J.F.K., Washington, D.C., September 20, 1960.

"If communism should obtain a permanent foothold in Latin America then the balance of power would move against us and peace would be even more insecure."—Candidate J.F.K., New York City, September 14, 1960.

I include some examples of the expressions of indignation for the RECORD in the hope that the administration will withdraw its support of this effort, the only result of which can be the support of communism and Castro—consistent with 1960 promises:

JACKSONVILLE, FLA.,

October 11, 1962.

Representative WILLIAM C. CRAMER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CRAMER: Congratulations on your stand and belief regarding the Cuban prisoner exchange deal. I consider this about the lowest possible thing that I know of for our President to sanction and encourage this blackmail and bribery. Thanking you for your stand and please keep fighting.

Z. V. ROSSER.

OCTOBER 11, 1962.

DEAR SIR: We agree with you in keeping the U.S. taxpayers money out of the Cuban ransom deal.

Sincerely,

Mr. and Mrs. GRAFTON COCHRAN, JR.

OCTOBER 10, 1962.

DEAR BILL: Just to let you know we are backing you in your efforts against negotiations being performed by Donovan.

Sincerely yours,

THOMAS A. and DOROTHY B. KIRK.

OCTOBER 11, 1962.

Representative WILLIAM C. CRAMER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: We concur with your estimate of the Cuban prisoner exchange deal; we think it does, too, in other words. To have arranged the exchange of Abel for Powers is a poor recommendation for New York Attorney James B. Donovan; it's downright suspicious, in fact. What about the Cuban children who have been shipped to Russia, Red China, and other Communist countries? Is anybody trying to effect their release?

Respectfully yours,

Mrs. H. M. THOMPSON.

OCTOBER 10, 1962.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I am backing you in your stand against negotiations being performed by Donovan, a private individual, trading with Cuba, an enemy country. This is contrary, I believe, to the Logan Act.

Sincerely,

HELEN M. BOSWORTH.

OCTOBER 11, 1962.

Hon. WILLIAM CRAMER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: What is all this talk about this James Donovan making deals with Castro for the prisoners held there? And who has authorized him to do so?

If I am not mistaken it was decided some time ago we would not be held up to pay ransom to that bearded butcher.

Has this matter of James Donovan making deals with Castro been discussed on Capitol Hill at this time—or is it none of the business of our Congressmen and Senators these days? Soon, at the rate we are going, we will not need our elected Members of Congress and Senators.

I would say the administration's leadership is talking out of both sides of their mouth and what is more in the act of blocking his country with one hand and handing him great quantities of food, medicine, and of all things money—taxpayers' money. How asinine.

Khrushchev will not have to bury us with such stupid leadership carrying out such deals. We are bankrupting our Nation and tearing it down morally with such lowbrow leadership these days.

With every good wish.

Very sincerely,

ELIZABETH DAVIS.

OCTOBER 11, 1962.

Hon. WILLIAM CRAMER,
Washington, D.C.

Hon. WILLIAM CRAMER: Have been reading about Donovan going to Cuba to offer food and drugs in exchange for the Cuban prisoners. Seems this would be a big help to the enemy who could so easily ship it to Russia, and the Cuban people would have no good of it. How mixed up can the State Department and others in Washington get?

We are certainly backing you in your stand against this, as well as other ways you are fighting communism.

Yours truly,

Mrs. MABEL KINSEY.

OCTOBER 10, 1962.

Hon. WILLIAM C. CRAMER,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN CRAMER: We are backing you all the way regarding Donovan, a private individual, trading with Cuba. The Cuban situation is most alarming and we hope the most drastic measures possible will be taken to oust the Russians from our doorstep. It is better to risk and even have war now than later on when we are isolated.

Thank you for the fine job you always do as our Congressman.

Sincerely,

Mr. and Mrs. ROBERT E. BAYLEY.

OCTOBER 10, 1962.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN CRAMER: I commend you highly on trying to bring out the hidden facts regarding the administration's role regarding its part in the release of Cuban prisoners. Food—medicine or money—what's the difference in blackmail? Let's keep America's image high—not lower it.

Very truly,

Mrs. RUSSELL G. LUDWIG.

REPRESENTATIVE WILLIAM C. CRAMER,
Florida.

DEAR SIR: I am in full accord with your demand for a congressional investigation that the U.S. Government may pay part of the ransom for Cuban invasion prisoners, if we pay this ransom or "blackmail" to the Castro government this Nation will have to hang its head in shame forever. There is too much double talking about what we will do, but never do, as President Kennedy said, no one should doubt our resolution in Laos, but the picture is that Laos has gone to the Communists. So let's begin to say a few things we mean and back our words with action if necessary in any way that will bring results.

Yours respectfully,

HARRY M. HOBROCK.

CONGRESSMAN WILLIAM CRAMER,
U.S. Congress,
Washington, D.C.

HONORABLE CONGRESSMAN: We wholeheartedly agree with your views on the Cuban prisoner deal. We admire you for having the intestinal fortitude to fight this disgraceful blackmail. It does one's heart good to know that we have one who is not afraid to fight for the rights of "The American citizen." We pray that you will succeed in your fight and wish you success in doing so.

Respectfully,

Mr. and Mrs. HENRY J. PLATE.

OCTOBER 11, 1962.

Hon. WILLIAM C. CRAMER,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE CRAMER: I have been reading with interest and concern about the proposed ransoming of the Bay of Pigs prisoners.

It would be a terrible mistake to give the enemy any succor. In the first place, people who feel strong enough about dictatorship and oppression to fight are the last to ask or approve any aid to the enemy. It is natural that relatives and loved ones, as well as our heart, ask that the prisoners be rescued but this is total war with communism.

Secondly, it doesn't make sense to give dollars and medicine with the right hand and then organize a blockade with the left.

Encourage the President to enforce a complete embargo on trade with Cuba but don't vote for or authorize one red cent, public or private, for Communist Castro's Cuba.

Respectfully offered,

FRED M. WHITAKER.

OCTOBER 11, 1962.

Hon. WILLIAM C. CRAMER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR SIR: May I extend my compliments upon your stand in connection with the Donovan deal.

I do not see how we can have a policy which asks the Greeks, the Swedes, the Norwegians and the British to withhold commerce from Cuba and, at the same time, even as ransom, permit the giving of more probably give (with taxpayer's money), \$62 million worth of food and drugs.

All reports in the press and elsewhere indicate that our South American neighbors have lost respect for our policy, due to our wavering on the Cuba situation. If this deal is permitted to go through, surely it cannot

October 13

22220

help but further lower our prestige there, if, indeed, it has not sunk below any recognizable level.

Yours sincerely,

BLAKE MORE GODWIN.

Thank you Congressman CRAMER for probing the Donovan-King John infamy.

How do the people of Florida put up with this punk in the W.H.?

MARIE HANNON.

OCTOBER 11, 1962.

DEAR BILL: I am with you 100 percent on the Cuba situation.

The people of Florida and the Nation will certainly be shocked should this Government allow itself to be blackmailed into contributing 1 penny toward the release of prisoners who by now have become thoroughly brainwashed.

What is wrong with our Government, especially our State Department?

Sincerely,

C. B. O'NEAL.

HOMESTEAD, FLA., October 11, 1962.

Congressman WILLIAM C. CRAMER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:

Even though my grandfather would turn in his grave and I will also before I recognize Republicanism, please continue to hold the Democrats feet to the fire on the Donovan intervention.

HARRY R. KNIGHT.

GAINESVILLE, FLA.,

October 11, 1962.

Representative WILLIAM CRAMER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:

Millions for fish tanks, nothing for human lives.

E. M. SOLOMON.

SAN DIEGO, CALIF.,

October 12, 1962.

Representative WILLIAM C. CRAMER,
House Committee,
Washington, D.C.:

Thank God for your stand against Communist blackmail. Keep up the good fight against the appeasers who are selling out America and the Constitution.

JOHN MASSEY.

ST. PETERSBURG, FLA.,

October 10, 1962.

HON. WILLIAM CRAMER,
Washington, D.C.:

Backing you to limit on your stand on Donovan exchange of prisoners.

FLORENCE M. CAMERON.

ST. PETERSBURG, FLA.,

October 10, 1962.

WILLIAM C. CRAMER,
Washington, D.C.:

I am backing you wholeheartedly on the Donovan issue.

Sincerely,

Mrs. C. G. BRIDGES.

ST. PETERSBURG, FLA.,

October 10, 1962.

Congressman WILLIAM C. CRAMER,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Backing you 100 percent on stand on Donovan as private individual trading with Cuba.

Sincerely,

Mr. and Mrs. LEE JEAN WELLS.

OCTOBER 10, 1962.

HON. WILLIAM C. CRAMER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: My friends and neighbors and all the members of the Women's Republican Club of St. Petersburg, Fla., are

certainly backing you in the position you have taken regarding the super-secret negotiations being performed by James B. Donovan, a private citizen, in connection with the release of 1,113 invasion prisoners in Cuba—this contrary to the Logan Act. We admire your fighting spirit in this respect—keep it up.

Respectfully yours,

OCTOBER 10, 1962.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: The 1,113 Cubans would not now be prisoners if you had met your commitment to provide air cover at the Bay of Pigs.

Now you are trying to remedy one small part of the results of your error by buying the release of the 1,113. What are you doing to liberate the other 6 million Cubans?

I object to the expenditure of taxpayers' money to pay blackmail.

I object to expedients such as this which will further make a laughingstock of this country.

I object to continued appeasement surrounded by noble talk.

Effective action is needed; and if you do something effective, the whole country will support you.

Very truly yours,

JOHN T. SALMON.

OCTOBER 10, 1962.

The SECRETARY OF STATE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: The 1,113 Cubans would not now be prisoners if you had met your commitment to provide air cover at the Bay of Pigs.

Now you are trying to remedy one small part of the results of your error by buying the release of the 1,113. What are you doing to liberate the other 6 million Cubans?

I object to the expenditure of taxpayers' money to pay blackmail.

I object to expedients such as this which will further make a laughingstock of this country.

I object to continued appeasement surrounded by noble talk.

Effective action is needed; and if you do something effective, the whole country will support you.

Very truly yours,

JOHN T. SALMON.

OCTOBER 10, 1962.

HON. WILLIAM C. CRAMER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: We are backing you all the way in regard to the Donovan case—a private individual trading with Cuba.

Respectfully yours,

Mrs. MARGARET T. BANTING.

OCTOBER 9, 1962.

HON. WILLIAM C. CRAMER,
Representative of the State of Florida,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CRAMER: With a full realization of time consumption of correspondence, I hesitate to write. However, there is a point that keeps coming to my mind, which is this: If our Congress is going to allow the Supreme Court (known sometimes as a school board) "to rewrite the Constitution to conform to the spirit of the times and to take into account sociological, if not ideological changes" (quote editorial—U.S. News & World Report, Oct. 1, 1962), I say again, If this is going to be, then also apply the spirit of times to the judges. The Supreme Court judges should be elected by the people. Again, I repeat, if they are going to write the laws (and be a school board), they should have to come before the people for election.

One other questions, Does our Congress of

the United States of America believe the 14th amendment changes the 10th amendment?

Stop Castro somehow.

It is with regret you will not be our Representative in 1963. We wish you well and keep plugging.

Very cordially yours,

J. E. BARBER.

OCTOBER 10, 1962.

HON. WILLIAM C. CRAMER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CRAMER: This is to advise you that my husband and I are against the negotiations being performed by James B. Donovan, a private individual trading with Cuba. We heartily approve of your stand in this matter. How can we expect cooperation of our allies by stopping trade with Cuba?

Good luck in your fight.

Sincerely yours,

Mrs. WILLIAM E. FILES.

OCTOBER 10, 1962.

DEAR MR. CRAMER: I am backing you to the limit in your stand against the method being used for the release of the Cuban prisoners.

Sincerely,

MARY D. BROWN.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: Your telegram to President Kennedy was a very apt and needful one in connection with the matter of ransoming the folks in Cuba. It is so strange why the administration goes about so many things in such half-cocked, blundering and ill-advised ways which, very obviously, will not pan out, or creates such bad impressions abroad and at home.

Respectfully,

OSCAR E. LANCASTER.

OCTOBER 10, 1962.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN CRAMER: My husband and I are backing you 100 percent in your opposition to the secretly arranged exchange (by Donovan) of surplus food and medicine for Cuban prisoners.

Sincerely,

Dr. and Mrs. R. B. LUTH.

OCTOBER 10, 1962.

Mr. CRAMER: Thank you for your courageous and forthright stand against this most recent "deal". I am constantly reminded of the old Americanism "Millions for Defense But Not One Cent for Tribute."

Your vigilance appreciated—and honored.

Sincerely,

SHIRLEY COBB.

OCTOBER 10, 1962.

HON. WILLIAM C. CRAMER,
U.S. Congress,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN CRAMER: I wholeheartedly support your views against the embarrassing situation in which our Government has become involved in the "money for prisoners deal" with Fidel Castro.

I deeply appreciate the position in which you have placed yourself politically by taking this stand and I want you to know that I am with you 100 percent, and if there is anything possible that I can do to help you in this coming campaign, do not hesitate to call on me.

Yours very truly,

W. A. BORDERS.

OCTOBER 10, 1962.

HON. WILLIAM CRAMER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR BILL: I, speaking for myself only, do feel you are so right on your stand against negotiations being made with Castro by Attorney James B. Donovan for release of 1,113

1962
invasion prisoners. Seems to me that is not the duty of a private individual in our country, to negotiate with another country. Where are our elected officials? What deals, or concessions are being made?

Seems to me our President is taking every possible way to circumvent our legislative bodies on every issue in which he can't have his own way.

Best wishes to you in this fight.

Sincerely,

DEAR MR. CRAMER: Supporting and backing you regarding Dr. Donavan exchange of surplus food and medicines for Cuban prisoners. Have written to President Kennedy protesting this action by Dr. Donavan.

Sincerely,

SHIRLEY B. FOUTS.

St. Petersburg, Fla.,
October 10, 1962.

Representative WILLIAM C. CRAMER,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Women's Republican Club of St. Petersburg, 1,970 members strong, back you to the limit in fight against private negotiations with Castro. Wires being sent to Dean Rusk and President Kennedy.

Mrs. JOHN T. SALMON.

OCTOBER 11, 1962.

HON. WILLIAM C. CRAMER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CONGRESSMAN: It is obvious that Fidel Castro, Ernesto Guevara and their associates in the Cuban Government are so firmly imbued with Communist doctrine that nothing short of force can cause them to change their position.

This being so, it is useless to hope for any improvement in relations with that government. They will continue to employ every means within their power to further the cause of communism and to set back the cause of the free world.

If the Castro government is to be dislodged, force must be employed. The U.S. Government has committed itself to refrain from using force in this matter. Rulers of the member nations of the Organization of American States are not eager to accept the social reforms implicit in all-out opposition to communism since they feel their position is stable so long as they have the support of the military, hence their support of the use of concerted force against the Castro government will be nominal, at best. The Cuban exiles are the ones who have lost the most from actions of the Castro government and who stand to gain the most from the dislodgement of the Castro Communist regime. Being intimately concerned, they will fight the hardest to restore Cuba to the free world.

It is therefore respectfully suggested that a Cuban government-in-exile be recognized as the logical and most effective means for the elimination of the Castro Communist tyranny and the restoration of civil rights to the oppressed peoples of Cuba.

Respectfully,

ROBERT O. WILKINSON, B.S.

OCTOBER 10, 1962.

JOHN F. KENNEDY,
President of the United States,
White House, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I thoroughly approve of Congressman CRAMER's opposition to the Cuban negotiations. I have bitterly opposed them from the start.

Since when do you negotiate with the enemy?

Since when do Christians negotiate with the Devil?

Is Florida to be a second Pearl Harbor? It was your kind who created the first,

idiotic parties to raise money for the Kennedy gang; this is more important than protecting decent American citizens, isn't it?

How much do you care for our beloved men rotting in Red Chinese prisons? In North Korea too and even Russia's slave labor camps?

Donovan's wheeling and dealing is a vicious violation of the Logan Act, but perhaps you are like Fulbright, Schlesinger et al and think "the people are too dumb to know." Powers and Able should have stayed where they were. We are at war.

Why do you lie and claim this is a private deal when we know it is our own tax money the CIA will hand over?

PT-109 indeed:

"Know therefore that Jehovah thy God, He is God, the faithful God, who keepeth covenant and loving kindness with them that love Him and keep His Commandments to a thousand generations."

HON. WILLIAM CRAMER,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: A goodly number of us are grateful to you for your strong position against our Government's paying blood-money to Communist Castro for his unfortunate captives.

I entreat you to continue in your effort to prevent such weak and cowardly action with every resource at your command, assured that the American people are prepared to provide you with moral, intellectual and emotional support.

The lives of those freedom fighters are too precious to be paid for in gold, and the United States of America must not do business in any case with unprincipled barbarians.

Yours truly,

MARY B. SNYDER.

OCTOBER 9, 1962.

MR. WILLIAM CRAMER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CRAMER: The writer wishes to congratulate you on the stand you have taken on sending a wire to our President to pick up the \$60 million tab. This is the taxpayers money and I, as one, do not see that our Government should give them (Commies) any food or drugs. What about our own boys in Russia and China that are suffering behind the Commies' curtains.

I think the American public should stand up and demand of our Government, who is paying this blackmail. At this time there is a lot of talk about the release of these prisoners, but there is nothing said about the \$60 million Castro demands for their release.

From my understanding of our Government this issue should be brought before our Congress.

Thanks for reading this.

Sincerely,

V. J. HENKE.

(Mr. CRAMER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

[Mr. CRAMER'S remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

TRI-CITY HARBOR, LAKE COUNTY, IND.

(Mr. O'HARA of Illinois asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, during the last few weeks we have heard considerable remarks on the House floor regarding the Burns Ditch Harbor on the south shore of Lake Michigan in Indiana.

We have also heard from the gentleman from Indiana, Congressman RAY J. MADDEN, regarding the practical advantages of the construction of the Tri-City Port Harbor adjacent to Hammond, East Chicago, and Whiting, Ind., in Lake County. The following letter from Mr. R. J. Smith, chairman, Rivers and Harbors Committee of the Hammond Chamber of Commerce contributes some solid information regarding the advantages of a harbor location in an area where three steel mills are already operating and several hundred more small industries could take advantage of the new harbor construction.

I am extending my remarks to include the following letters from the chairman of the Rivers and Harbors Committee of the Hammond Chamber of Commerce:

OCTOBER 10, 1962.

EDITORIAL PAGE EDITOR,
Gary Post Tribune,
Gary, Ind.

DEAR SIR: Your editorial of October 7 condemns the tricity port as a smokescreen attempt to defeat Burns Harbor and as impracticable. This is not only harsh but grossly inaccurate.

Professional opinion in behalf of the tricity port site is impressive. Prof. Harold Mayer, waterway and urban authority of the University of Chicago and author of an authoritative book on the St. Lawrence Seaway has endorsed this site as feasible. Morris N. Quade, consulting engineer and waterway expert of New York of the firm of Parsons, Brinkerhoff, Quade, and Douglas, has supported this Hammond, Whiting, East Chicago port in his professional capacity and as a member of a professional group that has made engineering studies of this site.

The proposed tricity harbor would be formed by connecting existing breakwaters at Indiana Harbor and at the Illinois-Indiana line with 4 miles of new breakwater. This would enclose a harbor area approximately 6 miles long and 2 miles wide which would allow 4,800 acres behind the breakwater for industrial and harbor development by fill methods. Engineering study shows that the 4,800 acres can be filled by low-cost methods that are economically compatible with its intended use.

The most important advantage of the tricity site is that it is the only site on any of the five Great Lakes that can act as a common terminal for the ocean vessels of the St. Lawrence Seaway and barges of the Mississippi-gulf barge system.

Congressman RAY MADDEN, of the Lake County congressional districts, the mayors of the four major cities of the county, the city councils of Hammond, Whiting, and East Chicago, the county commissioners of Lake County, Ind., major industries and labor unions in this county, including one of our largest steel mills and one of our largest unions, and the chambers of commerce of Hammond and East Chicago have all supported the tricity port study. This concerted effort led by Congressman MADDEN has been successful. Both House of the U.S. Congress have now passed an appropriation in the amount of \$50,000 for the first year of a 3-year feasibility study by the Corps of Army Engineers of the tricity site. A tricity harbor and industrial development has enormous significance for Lake County to restore high employment.

Many industries have left Lake County in recent years. Between 1957 and 1962 manu-

facturing jobs in Hammond alone have suffered a 20-percent reduction. Layoffs of Lake County steel workers reach 50 percent all too frequently. The Lake County steel district area is classified as a depressed area by the U.S. Bureau of Labor. Unemployment in Gary, Hammond, and East Chicago, is 7.3 percent, the highest for any of the seven major manufacturing districts in the State. By comparison, unemployment in the State is 4.8 percent; Indianapolis, 4.2 percent; and South Bend, 4.4 percent.

An economically depressed area in a county of 514,000 people is not only a local problem but a national one. Tricity port offers an unparalleled industrial opportunity for Lake County and the State of Indiana.

What does the proposed Burns Harbor offer to the Nation and the State? To the one steel mill now there (and no other steel mill has committed itself to building) the proposed Burns Harbor would be an outright subsidy and that steel mill would gain over 90 percent of the benefits. New and automated steel mills produce the same amount of steel with a fraction of the manpower. The manpower requirement per ton in an automated mill is estimated to be one-fourth that of an older mill. A new automated steel center at Burns Harbor made possible through a Federal grant of \$26 million and State revenue bond financing of \$38 million would further depress employment in the Lake County industrial area, Hammond through Gary.

The one steel company now located at Burns Ditch can build its own slips and docks as did the Gary mills. By so doing, its present commitment would be protected and it would not gain an unfair competitive advantage over other local steel mills.

The proponents of the tricity port rest their case on the merits of that location subject to confirmation by the now assured feasibility survey by the Army Engineers. This culminates an effort that goes back almost 50 years. A smokescreen doesn't have that kind of endurance, however diverting it may be as a rhetorical symbol.

R. J. SMITH.

WHITE HOUSE CONFERENCE ON NARCOTIC AND DRUG ABUSE

(MR. LIBONATI asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. LIBONATI. The White House Conference on Narcotic and Drug Abuse has completed its conference—an official transcript of the Conference is not available at this time. Dr. Lois L. Higgins, because of her specialized practical knowledge at all levels of this ugly subject received an invitation from the President, John Kennedy, to attend and participate in the discussions. The President realizes that there is no greater human problem confronting our Nation. Medical authority, sociologists, police experts, penologists, psychiatrists, and welfare authorities have studied this subject in all of its phases. Judges of the courts and enforcement officers and prosecutors have discussed and debated the various theories on what are the best procedures to deal with the addicts, pushers, and pushers of dope. Hospitalization facilities and related curative methods have been tested and experimented over the years.

We hope that the Conference through its open discussion of the various phases of this problem will make further con-

tributions to control of narcotics both in the habit and suppression of the traffic. Ultimately a cure will be found—meanwhile the treatment of the victim as a diseased person or incarceration as a felon or law violator must be determined by Federal statutes. We are anxious to review the discussions and findings of the Conference in order as legislators to aid us in our determinations. We are proud of those in attendance at the Conference and applaud and praise their efforts in their dedication to solve this problem for the health and happiness of these unfortunates and the alleviation of the anxieties of their families. We are indebted to Dr. Lois Higgins' report and congratulate her in her great career herein:

REPORT ON THE WHITE HOUSE CONFERENCE ON NARCOTIC AND DRUG ABUSE

(By Lois L. Higgins)

On May 28, 1962, the Honorable John F. Kennedy issued a statement announcing that a White House Conference on Narcotics would be held in late summer. He said:

"The problems arising out of the use of narcotics and other habit-forming drugs are many and varied including those of law enforcement, the treatment to be accorded addicts, posttreatment procedures and perhaps most importantly an accurate and up-to-date assessment of the particular nature and magnitude of addiction in the United States. It is our intention to bring to the Conference national authorities and leaders, including those in Federal, State, and local governments, to better understand the facets of addiction and to formulate a course of action designed to cope more effectively with this national problem area.

"The Attorney General will serve as General Chairman of the Conference. I have discussed this proposal with Governor Brown, of California, and Mayor Wagner, of New York City, who represent two jurisdictions where drug addiction is especially prevalent and they agree that such a conference could be most helpful. Many other government officials including Members of the Congress from those two areas have also urged that a conference be held."

Invitations were received in mid-September and upon responding, delegates received preconference materials of general interest, along with delegate badges for admission to the State Department Auditorium where the 400 invitees were to meet. Registration began at 8:30 a.m. on the morning of September 27, 1962.

Television and radio communications had been set up in the auditorium and they continued throughout the 2-day meeting.

The press was well represented and it appeared that the talks were being translated into different languages—but this is merely a conjecture based on the operations in view. It is not confirmed.

The President of the United States was introduced by the Honorable Robert Kennedy, Chairman. He advised the 400 delegates that this Conference could be only windowdressing, or, it could produce concrete programs for action at Federal, State, and local levels. He said that there is "no area where there is so much of mystery, misunderstanding and difference of opinion" as in the field of narcotic addiction. He stressed the need for elimination of illicit drug traffic and the need for greater emphasis on treatment of addicts. While the traffic in illegal drugs seems to have been lessened in recent years, he noted that there is growing abuse, especially among young people in the use of so-called nonnarcotic barbiturates and pep pills. He remarked with feeling "Society's gain will be illusory

if we have reduced the incidence of one kind of drug addiction only to have new kinds of drugs substituted."

President Kennedy expressed hope that Congress would pass a bill he requested strengthening Federal powers to control manufacture and distribution of barbiturates and stimulant drugs.

He mentioned that he had just presented a special citation to Harry Anslinger, retired Commissioner of Narcotics (Treasury Department) for outstanding service in reducing illegal drug traffic. He noted that the American people are most indebted to him (Anslinger) for his 45 years of Federal service.

The President mentioned the discouragingly large number of relapses among addicts who leave our medical institutions (Lexington and Fort Worth) free of any physical dependence on drugs—and noted that this makes it clear that more must be done.

The loudspeaker was not working properly and it was difficult to hear the next few speakers. However, it can be noted that Secretary of the Treasury Douglas Dillon, under whom the Narcotics Bureau (Federal) operates said that Treasury is concerned with the human and social aspects of addiction as well as stopping illegal traffic.

The new Secretary of HEW the Honorable Anthony J. Celebrezze told the delegates that "a program of civil commitment for addicts, coupled with a rehabilitative parole system would be an important forward step."

This statement reminded me that Attorney General Kennedy in opening the Conference stated "for all that is said, argued or believed about narcotics and drugs, the depressing truth is that we don't know very much about them. He referred to the working booklet 'Ad Hoc Panel' which delegates received prior to the Conference—noted that there is a very sharp drop in drug addiction after the age of 35 or 40, but that we can only guess at the reason." He went on "We can see that our job, therefore, is clear—it is to start finding out—to start building a reasonable and reliable body of information."

Governor Brown, of California, spoke of that State's fight against the problem and noted his own experience as former Attorney General. He said that California now has better laws and has been gaining in the fight since now there is the possibility of keeping parolees and probationers under supervision through the use of Nalline and the results of those tests. Governor Brown was an eloquent speaker and he could be heard by all. While great gains have been made there, he said, there is still a need for stricter laws and more adequate rehabilitation programs for addicts—in the local communities and at all levels. He also urged research.

Mayor Wagner addressed himself to the New York problem and stated that he too, favored strict penalties for peddlers and research into rehabilitation. He described the programs now in operation in New York City and expressed the hope that the Conference would be able to assist generally, in the entire area of narcotic and drug abuse problems.

In almost each speaker's text was reference to the new and growing problem of misuse of tranquilizers, barbiturates, pep pills, and other synthetic drugs. Statistics as to the increase in manufacture of these drugs was noted by almost every speaker.

Attached to this report is a copy of the entire program with speakers and subject matter information. It is impossible here to note the contribution of each, and it was indicated that the delegates will eventually receive copies of the texts.

With 1,200 miles of shoreline, with several ports of entry this poses a tremendous problem of keeping drugs out of country. He